

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 84 Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program Implementation Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	Amount Requested	\$ 3,260,156
Proposal Title	Tahoe-Sierra IRWM Implementation	Total Proposal Cost	\$ 9,549,412

PROJECT SUMMARY

Proposal includes 10 projects: (0) Grant Administration, (1) AWG Markleeville Creek Restoration Project, (2) TRWC – Negro Canyon Restoration, (3) Town Truckee – Water Quality Monitoring Program, (4) Washoe Tribe – Woodfords Water Supply Improvements, (5) TRCD – Regional AIS Outreach Framework, (6) Tahoe City PUD – West Lake Tahoe Regional Water Treatment Plant, (7) STPUD – Regional Water Use Efficiency Program, (8) Placer County – Griff Creek Water Quality Improvement, and (9) TRPA – BMP Implementation.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Technical Justification	6/10
Budget	3/5		
Schedule	3/5	Benefits and Cost Analysis	12/30
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	3/5	Program Preferences	10/10
Total Score (max. possible = 80)			46

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The applicant provides five goals and six accompanying objectives to help accomplish the listed goals, as well as individual goals and objective among the nine different projects. The work plan contains a tabulated overview, which includes a brief abstract and status update. A discussion is provided that describes the synergies and linkages among different project elements of the proposal. Maps are provided throughout, but all of them do not show relative project locations for any of the nine projects in relation to the IRWM region as a whole. Additionally, not all of the projects in the proposal contain tasks of adequate detail and completeness, so that it is clear that the project can be implemented. For example, the construction details for Project 6 lack detail. No plans and specifications are provided for any of the applicable projects, even though the applicant describes some of the projects possess plans and specs up to a 90% level. A few of

the projects tasks do not include appropriate deliverables and reporting submittals. For example, Project 8 does not list quarterly reports or CEQA as deliverables.

BUDGET

The budgets for more than half of the projects in the proposal have detailed cost information but many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, or documentation is lacking for a majority of the budget categories. The applicant provides a summary budget, individual budgets for each project, and the tasks are consistent with the work plan and schedule. However, it is difficult to judge the reasonableness of the costs for a majority of the projects. This is due to the budget attachment not containing an explanation of each project's costs estimates. As a result, the reviewer is not provided a nexus to evaluate the rationale for the estimated expenses provided.

SCHEDULE

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. While the schedule demonstrates a readiness to begin construction/implementation for all projects in the proposal before October 2014, the schedule is not fully consistent with the work plan and budget. For example, the schedule is not consistent with the work plan for various tasks in Projects 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, and 9. Additionally, the duration of some tasks is questionable. For example, the duration to acquire permits and prepare an EIS/MND for Project 6 appears short.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. Not all of the identified monitoring targets are appropriate for the benefits claimed. The applicant does not quantify target baselines for the goals of various projects in the attachment, even though the opportunity exists to do so. Furthermore, many of the goals listed in the attachment are not consistent with the goals listed in the work plan. Because of this inconsistency, it is difficult to judge the appropriateness of the benefits claimed.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete and insufficient. The physical benefits of some of the projects in the proposal are well-described and technically justified, however the description and justification of the physical benefits is lacking for many of the other projects. For example, there appears to be mathematical errors in the way Project 4 computed water savings and Green House Gas reduction, there are benefit redundancies in Project 7, and the manner in which sediment reduction is computed for Project 8 is not consistent between what is described in the attachment's narrative and what is listed in the table.

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Only three projects have listed monetized benefits. For the projects that claim flood control benefits, the applicant should quantify the monetary benefits. Non-monetized benefits claimed are speculative. Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a medium level of benefits in relationship to cost, but the quality of the analysis or clear and complete documentation is lacking.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant claims that five program preferences and eight statewide priorities will be met with project implementation. However, applicant demonstrates high degree of certainty, and adequate documentation for 11 of the Preferences claimed: (1) Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region identified in the CWP; RWQCB region or subdivision; or other region or sub-region specifically identified by DWR; (2) Effectively resolve significant water-related conflicts within or between regions; (3) Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the region; (4) Effectively integrate water management with land use planning; (5) Drought Preparedness; (6) Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently; (7) Climate Change Response Actions; (8) Practice

Integrated Flood Management; (9) Protect Surface Water and Groundwater Quality; (10) Improve Tribal Water and Natural Resources; and (11) Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits.